

Business Notices.

Vessels Advertised as Loading:

Rates. Passages, apply to the
 Company, No. 7, Praya Central.
 J. S. VAN DER
 Agent.
 1786 Hongkong, June 17, 1927.

1313	China, for Halpung.	Do.	(Wet bulb) 8 A.M.	81
1314	Yamato, for Hella.	Do.	Do. 1 P.M.	79
1315	Frsg. for Shanghai.	Do.	Do. 4 P.M.	70
1316	Dante for Saigon.	Do.	Atmos. 11 A.M.	84
1317	Chinthee for Swatow.	Do.	Maximum overcast	87

THE HONGKONG FREE PRESS
 Hongkong, April 14, 1897.

W3 | Alex Calde and Transporting Heavy
Vessels for the Military. W. H. H. H.

...of the new railway, and a ...
...the ...

THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 1897.

REUTERS TELEGRAMS.

[SUPPLIED TO THE "CHINA MAIL"]

LONDON, 16th June, 1897.

SUICIDE OF BARNEY BARNATO.

Barney Barnato committed suicide, on his way home, by jumping overboard from the *S. S. Scot* near Madeira.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

It is understood that as soon as the tariff is settled President McKinley will submit a treaty for the unconditional annexation of the Hawaiian Islands.

THE VENEZUELA QUESTION.

The final ratifications of the Anglo-American-Venezuelan boundary treaty have been exchanged at Washington.

A NEW CHINESE HOSPITAL AT SAMSHUPO.

HOW THE CHINESE PRESURE TO HAVE PLACED RESTRICTIONS.

At the meeting of the Sanitary Board this afternoon certain correspondence was read with reference to the erection of a Chinese Hospital on the confines of British territory. Inspector Hanson of the Water Police, reported that he had called on the Chinese Consul and found that the Chinese Consul had been in the Colony and in two of them found subscription books for the erection of a Chinese Hospital. At Cheung Shui Wan, a little east of the old hospital site, he found buildings in progress. Forty cells were being put up, and the Chinese Consul was to be enclosed by four by eight feet walls, and a bamboo fence was nearly finished. It was reported that a launch was to be built at the cost of \$8000. The Inspector met a man at the hospital who said that in 1894 during the plague people were restricted in their movements by the Government and his conversation seemed to indicate that in the case of another epidemic the hospital would be brought into requisition.

Dr. Clark wrote the following report, addressed to the Sanitary Board.

Hongkong, 31st May, 1897.

Sir, I have the honour to report for the information of the Board that I inspected the Hospital which is in process of erection at Samshupo on the 23rd inst. It is evidently intended to be a large building, and there is a building and on the site of the old hospital, 240 feet long, while the lateral enclosing walls are 160 feet long. The Hospital is apparently to be built on the same model as the Chinese Hospital at the same place, namely rows of cells, each about 7 feet, separated by passages 8 feet wide. There are two large windows with iron bars in each cell, giving thorough ventilation, while the rooms are fairly lofty, and the doors open on to the 8-foot lane. The floors have not yet been laid, but will be with the passages presumably be concrete. The buildings are being constructed of blue brick, with the enclosing walls of granite painted with cement. A large drain, built of granite, has been thrown across the outlet of a narrow gorge at the back of the Hospital, but whether it is intended to serve as a reservoir for water or not I cannot say.

The back of the Hospital is within ten feet of the conduit, which supplies fresh water to the tanks, and the water is almost certain to be contaminated by any cases of plague, cholera, or typhoid fever being treated in the Hospital.

No provision appears to have been made as yet for the drainage of the Hospital, except a surface channel on the western border, but this will not doubt flow when the floors are laid.

The hospital will undoubtedly be a grave source of danger to this Colony if used for the treatment of cases of infectious disease, for such cases will be smuggled into the colony, leaving infectious premises of which the Board knows nothing, while, again, convalescents will return here with infectious clothing or even before they themselves are free from infection. Both these conditions constantly happen at the present time, but with a native hospital which I can suggest, are to be put into operation without delay the scheme of medical inspection of all vessels entering the harbour, which has already been propounded by me, and during periods of special danger to control the entry of any Chinese into this Colony overland. I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant.

FRANCIS W. CLARK, Medical Officer of Health.

The Secretary in a minute recommended that the Board petition the Governor to apply to the Viceroy of Canton to close this hospital, which is likely to be a source of danger to the health of the Colony.

Mr. Chatham—Is the place under protection now?

Mr. Clark—Yes.

Mr. May—The first big typhoon will knock it down; it is badly put together.

Mr. Clark—I question whether it would not be wiser to build it up so as to be used as an hospital. We have no evidence that it is to be used as an hospital.

Mr. Atkinson—It is not occupied yet.

Mr. Chatham—I think it might be stated that it has been recommended that it is to be used for that purpose.

Mr. Atkinson—We have the report of the Medical Officer of Health on this building which is now evidently in course of erection. It is situated a little to the east of the former hospital, that was there and, therefore, nearer the water supply than the conduit, which supplies water to the shipping, and is likely to prove a source of danger, as pointed out by the report of the Medical Officer of Health. I beg to move that the Government communicate with the Viceroy of Canton with the view to the prevention of the building being used as an hospital, as in our opinion it would prove a source of danger to the public health of the Colony.

Mr. Chatham seconded.

Carried.

Dr. Clark appears here to have raised the same question which, in August 1894, was raised in these columns; and, in view of all the conditions (actual and possible) his letter must be received with general approval.

—E. C. B.

PARENT MIND BOXES, Violins (fine models), Mandolins, and Strings of all kinds. W. Robinson & Co.

The *Singapore Morning Herald* of the 17th May says:—The steamer of the E. & A. Company's line, which sailed yesterday for China, has on board gold to the value of \$2600 shipped by the Chinese. Lead in bars from which all the silver has been extracted for a considerable feature of the export trade from this country to China.

The steamer *Guillem*, which on Saturday last left for China, took a shipment of over 5000 bars, a by no means uncommon quantity in an outward-bound Chinese steamer's hold.

SUPREME COURT.

IN ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION.

(Before His Honour Sir John Carrington, Chief Justice.)

Thursday, June 17.

THE CHINA NAVIGATION CO. LTD. v. THE STEAMSHIP "NORMANDIE."

The defendants moved for a dismissal of the plaintiff's action on the ground that proceedings have already been taken in Shanghai.

Mr. J. J. Francis, Q.C. (instructed by Mr. G. C. O. Master), appeared for the plaintiffs, and Mr. E. Robinson (instructed by Mr. J. Hastings) for the defendants.

His Lordship delivered judgment as follows:—This is a motion by which the defendants seek to have the writ of summons and all subsequent proceedings in the action set aside, and the security given by them discharged, on the ground that the plaintiffs have recovered judgment against them in Her Britannic Majesty's Supreme Court for China and Japan in respect of the same cause of action. They also seek for their costs of the action. It will be convenient to state the circumstances under which the motion comes to be made.

The writ of summons was issued on the 23rd July, 1896, by the plaintiffs against the owners of the steamship *Pekin*, claimed the sum of \$50,000 against the steamship *Normandie* for damages occasioned by a collision which took place in the Winoanque river, at the port of Shanghai, on the 3rd April, 1896. The *Normandie* was arrested, and was subsequently released, with the consent of the plaintiffs. On the 5th November, 1896, the defendants moved the Court for an order to stay all proceedings in the action pending the hearing and decision on appeal to the Privy Council from Her Britannic Majesty's Supreme Court for China and Japan in suit wherein the defendants, the owners of the steamship *Normandie*, were plaintiffs and appellants, and the plaintiffs, the owners of the steamship *Pekin*, were defendants and respondents. From the judgment given on the hearing of that motion it appeared that the defendants, as owners of the *Normandie*, had sued the plaintiffs, as owners of the *Pekin*, in the Supreme Court at Shanghai, for damages in respect of the collision which took place between the two vessels on the 3rd April, 1896; that the plaintiffs obtained leave from the Court to file a counter-claim against the defendants in respect of the same collision; and that, on the hearing of the counter-claim, the judgment of the Court was given against the defendants, and the plaintiffs were ordered to pay the costs of the counter-claim, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It further appeared that an application made by the plaintiffs that the damages and losses might be assessed and final judgment entered up against the defendants for the amount assessed, with costs, was dismissed, and the case was ordered to be dismissed, and the costs of the action were ordered to be paid by the plaintiffs. It also appeared that, on the application of the defendants, the Court gave them leave to appeal to Her Majesty in Council against the judgment. After the motion for judgment was made, the plaintiffs had been given leave to file a counter-claim against the defendants, and the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court made a conditional order for staying proceedings in the action, on the ground that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action.

It was contended by Mr. Robinson for the plaintiffs, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the plaintiffs, and the defendants were ordered to pay the costs of the action. It was contended by Mr. Francis for the defendants, that the Court had given judgment in favour of the

NOTICES TO CONSIGNEES.

FROM HAMBURG, PENANG AND SINGAPORE.

THE Steamship *Della*, Capt. CHRISTIANSEN, having arrived from the above Ports, Consignees of Cargo are hereby requested to send in their Bills of Lading for counter-signature by the Underwriter, and to take immediate delivery of their Goods from alongside.

Optional Cargo will be forwarded unless notice to the contrary be given before 10 a.m. To-morrow.

Any Cargo impeding the discharge will be landed into the Godowns of the Hongkong & Kowloon Wharf & Godown Co., Ltd., and stored at Consignees' risk and expense.

No Claims will be admitted after the Goods have left the Godowns, and all Goods remaining undischarged after the 23rd Inst., will be subject to rent.

All broken, chafed, and damaged Goods are to be left in the Godowns, where they will be examined on the 23rd Instant, at 3 p.m.

No Fire Insurance has been effected.

SIEMSEN & Co., Agents.

Hongkong, June 16, 1897. 1209

THE PENINSULAR & ORIENTAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY'S STEAMER *RAVENNA*.

FROM BOMBAY, COLOMBO AND STRAITS.

CONSIGNEES of Cargo by the above-named Vessel are hereby informed that their Goods are being landed and placed at their risk in the Godowns and Kowloon Wharf and Godown Company's Godowns at Kowloon, where each consignment will be sorted out Mark by Mark and delivery can be obtained as soon as the Goods are landed.

This Vessel brings on Cargo:—
From GIBRALTAR, ex s.s. *Shannon*.
From PERSIAN GULF, ex s.s. *Anglia*, *Kupferstuck* and *King Arthur*.

Optional Goods will be landed here unless instructions are given to the contrary before 4 p.m. To-morrow.

Goods not cleared by the 17th Instant, at 4 p.m., will be subject to rent.

No Fire Insurance will be effected by me in any case whatever.

All Damaged Packages must be left in the Godowns and a certificate of the damage obtained from the Godown Company within ten days after the vessel's arrival here, after which no Claims will be recognised.

H. A. RITCHIE, Superintendent.

Hongkong, June 11, 1897. 1177

NOTICE TO CONSIGNEES.

FROM CALCUTTA, PENANG AND SINGAPORE.

THE S.S. *Arratoon* after having arrived from the above Ports, Consignees of Cargo are hereby informed that their Goods will be delivered from alongside.

Cargo impeding the discharge or remaining on board after 4 p.m. of the 17th June, will be landed at Consignees' risk and expense into the Godowns of the Hongkong & Kowloon Wharf and Godown Company, Limited, at Wharfedale.

Consignees of Cargo from SINGAPORE and PENANG are requested to take immediate delivery of their Goods from alongside; such Cargo impeding the discharge of the vessel will be landed and stored at Consignees' risk and expense.

No Fire Insurance will be effected. Bills of Lading will be counter-signed by DAVID SASSOON, SONS & Co., Agents.

Hongkong, June 16, 1897. 1194

Intimations.

Kinghorn & Macdonald,

Consulting Mechanical Engineers and Surveyors,
CONTRACTORS FOR THE SUPPLY OF ALL KINDS OF MACHINERY AND APPLIANCES.

SPECIFICATIONS, DESIGNS and DRAWINGS prepared for all Classes of STEAMSHIPS, MACHINERY and BOILERS.

New Work and Repairs supervised. Surveys undertaken and Reports prepared.

Telegrams, "KINGHORN," Hongkong. Telephone, No. 141.

JOHN W. KINGHORN, M.I.M.E., M.I.Mech.-E., London.

DONALD MACDONALD, Hongkong, November 6, 1896. 2238

NOTICE.

FOR SALE.

WOODS' ORBELLATED VIO-

TOLEMAN BRAND (COW BRAND) in 1 lb., 2 lb., 5 lb., and 10 lb. Tins, in QUANTITIES OF NOT LESS THAN ONE CASE.

Smaller Quantities may be obtained at the TY-SING, KWAN-TAI, NAM-HING-LOONG and all the principal Ship's Gun-providers, Market, and Provision Shops.

GEO. P. LAMBERT, Sole Agent for Hongkong, the Coast of China and the Philippines.

Hongkong, June 1, 1897. 1176

For Nervous Exhaustion

CHAPOTEAU'S

Phosphoglycerate

OF LIME

The modern restoration

of the nervous system.

For individuals, professional men, teachers, students, etc., and its debility, neuralgia, headache, dyspepsia of nervous origin and insomnia.

It is readily assimilated and promotes digestion.

PHOSPHOGLYCERATE SYRUP (CHAPOTEAU'S)

PHOSPHOGLYCERATE WINE (CHAPOTEAU'S)

PHOSPHOGLYCERATE CAPSULES (CHAPOTEAU'S)

Sole Agent for Hongkong, the Coast of China and the Philippines.

GEO. P. LAMBERT & Co., Chemists.

For Sale by A. H. WATSON & Co., Chemists.

Shipping.

Steamers.

CHINA NAVIGATION COMPANY, LIMITED.

FOR PORT DARWIN, QUEENSLAND PORTS, SYDNEY & MELBOURNE.

The Co.'s Steamship *Fochau*, Capt. BLACKBURN, will be despatched on FRIDAY, the 18th Instant, at 3 p.m.

For Freight or Passage, apply to BUTTERFIELD & SWIRE, Agents.

Hongkong, June 16, 1897. 1199

INDO-CHINA STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY, LIMITED.

FOR TIENSIN (DIRECT).

The Co.'s Steamship *Takung*, Captain ROULE, will be despatched on SATURDAY, the 19th Instant, at Noon.

For Freight or Passage, apply to JARDINE, MATHESON & Co., General Managers.

Hongkong, June 11, 1897. 1175

CHINA NAVIGATION COMPANY, LIMITED.

FOR PORT DARWIN, QUEENSLAND PORTS, SYDNEY & MELBOURNE.

The Co.'s Steamship *Taiwan*, Captain MOORE, will be despatched on SATURDAY, the 19th Instant, at 3 p.m.

The attention of Passengers is directed to the Superior Accommodation offered by this Steamer. First-class Saloon is situated forward of the Engine.

A Refrigerating Chamber ensures the supply of Fresh Provisions during the entire voyage.

A duly-qualified Surgeon in attendance, and the Vessel is fitted throughout with Electric Light.

N.B.—Return Tickets issued by this Company to and from AUSTRALIA are available for Return by Steamers of the Eastern and Australian S.S. Co., and vice versa.

For Freight or Passage, apply to BUTTERFIELD & SWIRE, Agents.

Hongkong, June 4, 1897. 1141

CHINA NAVIGATION COMPANY, LIMITED.

FOR KOBE (DIRECT).

The Co.'s Steamship *Tsima*, Captain RAMSAY, will be despatched on SATURDAY, the 19th Instant, at 4 p.m.

For Freight or Passage, apply to BUTTERFIELD & SWIRE, Agents.

Hongkong, June 14, 1897. 1102

FOR YOKOHAMA AND KOBE.

The Steamship *Della*, Captain CHRISTIANSEN, will be despatched on SATURDAY, the 19th Instant, at 5 p.m.

This Steamer has superior Accommodation for First and Second Class Passengers and carries a Doctor and a Stewardess.

For Freight or Passage, apply to SIEMSEN & Co., Agents.

Hongkong, June 13, 1897. 1210

NIPPON YUSEN KAISHA.

JAPAN-AUSTRALIA LINE.

MONTHLY SERVICE.

(Under Mail Contract).

FOR NAGASAKI, KOBE AND YOKOHAMA.

The Co.'s Steamship *Fumatsuki Maru*, Captain J. J. Jones, will be despatched for the above Ports on MONDAY, the 21st Inst., at Noon.

This Steamer is fitted with Superior Passenger Accommodation, and is lit by Electricity throughout.

For Freight or Passage, apply to NIPPON YUSEN KAISHA.

Hongkong, June 14, 1897. 1188

FOR SINGAPORE, PENANG AND CALCUTTA.

The Steamship *Arratoon*, Capt. K. H. SWENBERG, will be despatched on MONDAY, the 21st Instant, at 3 p.m.

For Freight or Passage, apply to DAVID SASSOON, SONS & Co., Agents.

Hongkong, June 16, 1897. 1199

INDO-CHINA STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY, LIMITED.

FOR SAMARANG AND SOERABAYA.

The Co.'s Steamship *Huising*, Captain CHOCRETT, will be despatched on MONDAY, the 21st Instant, at 4 p.m.

For Freight or Passage, apply to JARDINE, MATHESON & Co., General Managers.

Hongkong, June 14, 1897. 1186

COMPAGNIE DES MESSAGERIES MARITIMES.

PAQUEBOTS POSTE FRANCAIS.

FOR SHANGHAI, KOBE AND YOKOHAMA.

The Co.'s Steamship *Melbourne*, Captain DUBREUIL, will be despatched for the above Ports on or about MONDAY, the 21st Instant.

G. de CHAMPEAUX, Agent.

Hongkong, June 14, 1897. 1186

Shipping.

Steamers.

MOGUL-WARRACK-MILBURN LINE.

FOR NEW YORK VIA SUEZ CANAL.

The Steamship *Sida*, Captain ROWLEY, to be despatched for the above Port on FRIDAY, the 18th June, 1897.S.S. *Argyll*, to sail about 3rd July, 1897.S.S. *Afridi*, to sail about 18th July, 1897.S.S. *Lennox*, to sail about 2nd Aug., 1897.

For Freight or Passage, apply to DODWELL, CARLILL & Co., Agents.

Hongkong, June 13, 1897. 1120

DOUGLAS STEAMSHIP COMPANY, LIMITED.

FOR AMOY AND TAMSUI.

The Co.'s Steamship *Huamun*, Captain BATHURST, will be despatched for the above Ports on SATURDAY, the 19th Instant, at Noon.

For Freight or Passage, apply to DOUGLAS LAPIRAK & Co., General Managers.

Hongkong, June 16, 1897. 1207

DOUGLAS STEAMSHIP COMPANY, LIMITED.

FOR SWATOW, AMOY AND TAIWANFOO.

The Co.'s Steamship *Thales*, Captain DODWELL, will be despatched for the above Ports on SUNDAY, the 20th Instant, at Daylight.

For Freight or Passage, apply to DOUGLAS LAPIRAK & Co., General Managers.

Hongkong, June 16, 1897. 1208

THE CHINA MUTUAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY, LIMITED.

FOR LONDON, VIA STRAITS AND USUAL PORTS OF CALL.

(Taking Cargo at through rates for GLASGOW, LIVERPOOL, CONTINENTAL PORTS, LIVER PLATE, &c.)

The Co.'s Steamship *Torricelli*, Gen. LOPE, Commander, will be despatched on SATURDAY, the 19th Instant, at 4 p.m.

For Freight or Passage, apply to HOLLIDAY, WISE & Co., Agents.

Hongkong, June 14, 1897. 1187

SHIRE LINE OF STEAMERS.

FOR NEW YORK VIA SUEZ CANAL.

The Co.'s Steamship *Carna*, Captain THURTELL, will be despatched for the above Port on or about the 26th Instant.

For Freight or Passage, apply to SHEWAN, TOMES & Co., Agents.

Hongkong, June 16, 1897. 1211

'BEN' LINE OF STEAMERS.

FOR LONDON VIA SUEZ CANAL.

The Steamship *Benedict*, Captain FARGHALL, due here on or about 10th June, will have quick despatch.

For Freight or Passage, apply to GIBB, LIVINGSTON & Co., Agents.

Hongkong, May 21, 1897. 1036

Sailing Vessels.

FOR NEW YORK.

The 100 A.I. British Ship *Clan Macdonald*, Captain HENDERSON, having arrived, will load here for the above Port, and will have quick despatch.

For Freight, apply to ARNOLD, KARBURG & Co., Agents.

Hongkong, June 12, 1897. 919

FOR SAN FRANCISCO.

The 100 A.I. British Barque *Heathorn*, Captain MCKENZIE, has or, shortly expected, will load here for the above Port and will have quick despatch.

For Freight, apply to SHEWAN, TOMES & Co., Agents.

Hongkong, June 16, 1897. 1212

AN EFFECTUAL STOP

IS PUT TO ALL ANXIETY

BY THE NEW GUARANTEED CASH

VALUE POLICY

OF THE

'EQUITABLE'

This Policy provides three things: (1) Protection for the family; (2) Provision for the assured's later years; (3) A valuable investment.

When three annual premiums have been paid the policy acquires yearly thereafter three distinct GUARANTEED values: (1) paid-up assurance; (2) Cash; (3) Loan at 5 per cent.

This policy is procured by experienced men of business to be the best and most liberal contract of life insurance ever issued, and it is offered by an office having the splendid SURPLUS of £2,000,000 sterling to support its GUARANTEES.

Full Particulars and Illustrations from the GUARANTEE OFFICE.

SHEWAN, TOMES & Co., Agents.

J. T. HAMILTON, Manager for the East.

Hongkong, October 17, 1896. 1187

Mails.

NORDEUTSCHER LOYD.

NOTICE.

STEAM FOR SINGAPORE, COLOMBO, ADEN, SUZUKI, PORT SAID, NAPLES, GENOA, ANTWERP, BREMEN & HAMBURG, PORTS IN THE LEVANT, BLACK SEA & BALTIC PORTS;

LONDON, NEW YORK, BOSTON, BALTIMORE, NEW ORLEANS, GALVESTON & SOUTH AMERICAN PORTS.

THE COMPANY'S STEAMERS WILL CALL AT SOUTHAMPTON TO LAND PASSENGERS AND LOGGERS.

N.B.—Cargo can be taken on through bills of Lading for the principal places in RUSSIA.

PROPOSED SAILINGS FROM HONGKONG.

SUBJECT TO ALTERATION.

Preussen, Tuesday, June 22.

Sachsen, Tuesday, July 10.

Bayern, Tuesday, August 17.

Prinz Heinrich, Tuesday, September 14.

Preussen, Tuesday, October 12.

Sachsen, Tuesday, November 9.

Bayern, Tuesday, December 7.

Prinz Heinrich, Tuesday, January 4.

ON TUESDAY, the 22nd day of June, 1897, at 9 a.m., the Company's S.S. *PREUSSEN*, Captain P. WETTER, with MAILS, PASSENGERS, SPEUL, and CARGO, will leave this port as above, calling at NAPLES and GENOA.

Shipping Orders will be granted all Noon, on SATURDAY, the 19th June, Cargo and Space will be received on board until 5 p.m., on MONDAY, the 21st June, and Parcels will be received at the Agency's Office until Noon, on MONDAY, the 21st June. Contents of Packages are required. No Parcel Receipts will be signed for less than £2.50, and Parcel should not exceed Two Feet Cubic in measurement.

The Steamer has splendid Accommodation and carries a Doctor and Stewardess. Linen can be washed on board.

For further Particulars, apply to MELOERS & Co., Agents.

Hongkong, May 27, 1897. 1082

NOTICE.

COMPAGNIE DES MESSAGERIES MARITIMES.

PAQUEBOTS POSTE FRANCAIS.

STEAM FOR SINGAPORE, BATAVIA, COLOMBO, BOMBAY, ADEN, EGYPT, MARSSEILLE, MEDITERRANEE AND BLACK SEA PORTS, LONDON, HAVRE AND BORDEAUX.

ALSO PORTS OF BRAZIL & RIVER PLATE.

ON WEDNESDAY, the 23rd June, at Noon, the Company's Steamship *NATAL*, Captain CHEVALIER, with MAILS, PASSENGERS, SPEUL, and CARGO, will leave this port as above, calling at COLOMBO, BOMBAY, ADEN, EGYPT, MARSSEILLE, MEDITERRANEE AND BLACK SEA PORTS, LONDON, HAVRE AND BORDEAUX.This Steamer connects at COLOMBO with the *a.s. Grand Rhodé*, which vessel takes on her Passengers and Mails, leaving that Port on the 4th July, direct to SUEZ, PORT SAID and MARSEILLES.

Cargo and Space will be received for London as well as for Marseilles, and accepted in transit through Marseilles for the principal places of Europe.

Shipping Orders will be granted all Noon.

Cargo will be received on board until 4 p.m. Sunday and Parcels until 3 p.m. of 22nd June. (Parcels are not to be taken on board; they must be left at the Agency's Office.)

Contents and value of Packages are required.

For further particulars, apply to the Company's Office.

G. DE CHAMPEAUX, Agent.

Hongkong, June 10, 1897. 1171

NORTHERN PACIFIC STEAMSHIP AND RAILWAY COMPANIES.

VIA INLAND SEA OF JAPAN.

THE attention of Passengers is directed to the very cheap rates offered by the Line to the PACIFIC COAST and to the INTERIOR and EASTERN CITIES of the UNITED STATES and CANADA and to EUROPE.

HONGKONG TO LONDON, \$400.

HONGKONG TO NEW YORK, \$250.

The Railroad travelling is second to none in the American Continent. Magnificent Scenery of the Rocky and Cascade Mountains.

The Yellowstone National Park.

Passengers to EUROPE may proceed by one of the first class ATLANTIC MAIL LINES.

HONGKONG TO TACOMA, \$225.

Rates of Passage to other Ports on application.

Special rates allowed to members of Government Services.

PROPOSED SAILINGS FROM HONGKONG. (SUBJECT TO ALTERATION.)

Olympia, Tuesday, July 6.

Pallas, Tuesday, July 27.

Tacoma, Tuesday, Aug. 17.

Victoria, Tuesday, Sept. 7.

Olympia, Tuesday, Sept. 28.

Columbia, Tuesday, Oct. 19.

THE Steamship *OLYMPIA*, Captain HENDERSON, sailing at Noon, on TUESDAY, the 6th July, will proceed to VICTORIA, (B.C.), and TACOMA (Wash.), via KOBE and YOKOHAMA.

Through Bills of Lading issued to Pacific Coast Ports, and to Canadian and United States Ports, and to California and Oregon, will be granted on or about MONDAY, the 7th day previous to sailing.

For further information as to Passage or Freight, apply to DODWELL, CARLILL & Co., General Agents.

Hongkong, June 1, 1897. 1129

Mails.

U. S. Mail Line.

PACIFIC MAIL STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

VIA INLAND SEA OF JAPAN AND HONOLULU.

PROPOSED SAILINGS FROM HONGKONG.

China (via Shanghai, Nagasaki, Kobe, Inland Sea, Yokohama & H'ulu), SATURDAY, June 26, at noon.

Peru (via Shanghai, Nagasaki, Kobe, Inland Sea and Yokohama), THURSDAY, July 15, at noon.

City of Rio de Janeiro (via Shanghai, Nagasaki, Kobe, Inland Sea, Yokohama & H'ulu), TUESDAY, August 3, at noon.

THE U.S. Mail Steamship *CHINA* will be despatched for SAN FRANCISCO, via SHANGHAI, NAGASAKI, KOREA, INLAND SEA, YOKOHAMA and HONOLULU, on SATURDAY, the 26th June, at Noon, carrying passengers and freight to Japan, the United States, and Europe.

Steamers of this line pass through the INLAND SEA OF JAPAN, and call at HONOLULU, and passengers are allowed to break their journey at any point en route.

Through Passage Tickets granted to England, France, and Germany by all trans-Atlantic lines of Steamers, and to the principal cities of the United States and Canada. Rates may be obtained on application.

Passengers holding through ORDERS TO EUROPE have the choice of the Overland Rail routes from San Francisco, including the SOUTHERN PACIFIC, CENTRAL PACIFIC, UNION PACIFIC, DENVER and RIO GRANDE and NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILWAYS; also the CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY on payment of \$4 in addition to the regular tariff rate.

Passengers holding orders FOR OVERLAND CITIES in the United States have, between San Francisco and Chicago, the option of the SOUTHERN PACIFIC, CENTRAL PACIFIC, UNION PACIFIC, DENVER and RIO GRANDE and other direct connecting Railways, and from Chicago to destination, the choice of direct lines.

Particulars of the various routes can be had on application.

Special rates (first class only) are granted to Missionaries, members of the Navy, Military, Diplomatic, and Civil Services, to European officials in service of China and Japan, and to Government officials and their families.

Through Bills of Lading issued for trans-

